



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/775,805	02/05/2001	Barton F. Haynes	1579-548	4002

7590 01/22/2003

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201

EXAMINER

STUCKER, JEFFREY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1648

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/26/02
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 2-12 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 2-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 9-12 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, SEQ ID NO:39, in Paper No. 9 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that limiting the examination to a single sequence would preclude applicants from obtaining consideration on the merits of a claim for a particular combination of peptides which "unfairly disadvantages" applicant and would be grossly unfair. This is not found persuasive because each application is charged a flat fee regardless of the number of sequences, the examination of which uses Office resources. Though applicant may think it unfair, this is the policy that the Office has announced and requires the examiners to abide by.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Yet another new table 3 is required because the Faxed copy is unreadable.

Appropriate correction is required.

The abstract is objected to for failing to adequately describe the claimed invention. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

Claims 9, 11, and 12 are objected to for containing non-elected sequences.

35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the invention as disclosed is inoperative and therefore lacks patentable utility.

The invention is directed to a vaccine composition and method of vaccinating against HIV with the vaccine. Thus, the ultimate utility of the instant invention would be whatever the ultimate utility of the identified molecules is. Based upon the disclosure, as well as the nature of HIV, it is clear that the specification envisions a pharmaceutical utility for these compounds in humans.

While the specification does contain statements regarding the use of the invention as a vaccine, the specification fails to teach, nor does it describe such use. There is a discussion of a small phase one trial which involved HIV positive individuals who exhibited an immune response. However, there is no indication that the composition was protective. The difficulties inherent to development of an HIV vaccine are well known and some of which are noted in the disclosure. Specifically, "The extraordinary ability of HIV to mutate, the inability of many currently known specificities of anti-HIV antibodies to consistently neutralize HIV primary isolates, and the lack of a complete understanding of the correlates of protective immunity to HIV infection have impeded efforts to develop an HIV vaccine having the desired effectiveness."

Other concerns that need to be addressed are:

1)the extensive genomic diversity associated with the HIV retrovirus, due in large part to error prone reverse transcription of its single-stranded RNA genome,

2)the fact that the modes of viral transmission include virus-infected mononuclear cells, which pass the infecting virus to other cells in a covert form (cell to cell transmission), as well as via free virus transmission,

3)the existence of latent forms of the virus (i.e., beyond the blood-brain barrier),

5)the complexity and variation of the elaboration of the disease and,

6)the property of some portions of HIV proteins or peptides to actually cause immunosuppression or other detrimental consequences.

The existence of these obstacles prevents one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any vaccine or immunization treatment or any therapeutic regimen on its face. In order to provide proof of utility with regard to drugs and their uses, either clinical or *in vivo* or *in vitro* data, or a combination of these can be used. However, the data must be such as to convince one of ordinary skill in the art that the proposed utility is sufficiently established. See *in re Irons*, 340 F.2d 924, 144 USPQ 351 (CCPA 1965), *Ex parte Krepelka*, 231 USPQ 746 (PTO Bd. Pat. App & Inter. 1986) and *Ex parte Chwang*, 231 USPQ 751 (PTO Bd. Pat. App

& Inter. 1986). Applicant's disclosure does not provide evidence of having invented an HIV vaccine.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an immunogenic composition, does not reasonably provide enablement for a vaccine. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant invention is drawn to a vaccine composition comprising SEQ ID NO: 39 but the specification does not sufficiently support the full scope of the claimed vaccine. The term "vaccine" by definition implies a preparation intended for active immunological prophylaxis; e.g., preparations of killed microbes of virulent strains or living microbes of attenuated (variant or mutant) strains; or microbial, fungal, plant, protozoa, or metazoan derivatives or products. Although nearly any protein when inoculated can cause an immune reaction, the prophylactic nature of

this reaction is not guaranteed and has to be experimentally determined. Prophylaxis is defined as the prevention of disease or of a process that can lead to disease. For example, the Illustrated Dictionary of Immunology defines vaccine as a composition that stimulates protective antibodies and T cell immunity and induces active immunity. Paul in *Fundamental Immunology* teaches that vaccines were developed primarily as a prophylactic measure to prevent disease. This is achieved by use of an antigenic (immunogenic) agent to actively stimulate the immunological mechanism, or the administration of chemicals or drugs to members of a community to reduce the number of carriers of a disease and to prevent others from contracting the disease. Testing protocols are designed to test the efficacy of the vaccines which include challenge trials or natural exposure to the disease agent in an endemic area. Further, he teaches that there is not always a correlation between seroconversion and protection from disease. Given the teachings in the art, it is clear that a compound that merely induces an immune response is not sufficient but must be protective to qualify as a vaccine. See at the top of page 1312: "[T]here was not always a correlation between seroconversion and protection from disease...." There are no challenge studies with wild type virus.

The ability of a vaccine to raise a protective immune response depends on the structure of the protein epitopes. Paul teaches



that to determine the immunogenicity of certain regions of a protein, knowledge of the three dimensional structure of the protein is required to determine which polypeptides in a given protein would be accessible on the surface of the protein in order for the putative antigenic determinant to be bound by the antibody. In addition, Paul states that mobility of the putative antigenic determinant within the native protein structure is also a determining factor for the binding of the antigenic determinant to an antibody. Paul points out (page 250, lines 4-8) that "Measurement of the mobility in the native protein is largely dependent on the availability of a high resolution crystal structure, so its applicability is limited to only a small subset of proteins." Riffkin et al. (Gene, 1995) teaches that a single amino acid change can alter the structure of the protein dramatically. Abaza et al. (J. of Protein Chemistry, 1992) teaches that mutations outside of the antigenic epitope exert an effect on the structure of the epitope. Because the structure of the protein determines its antigenicity and thereby its function as a vaccine, these structures can not be predicted. In regards to the factors cited in the lack of utility rejection, applicant's specification does not address these factors and does not disclose that the instant invention has overcome these problems.

Serial Number: 09/775805  
Art Unit: 1648

9

Given the uncertainty in the vaccine art as demonstrated by the references and the lack of working examples in the instant specification, the instant application is not enabled for vaccines or methods of vaccinating.

No claims are allowed.

Papers related this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG (November 15, 1989).


The Group 1600 Fax numbers are: (703) 308-4242 and (703) 305-3014.

Unofficial communications may be faxed to: (703) 308-4426.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Stucker whose telephone number is (703) 308-4237. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Thursday from 7:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel, can be reached on (703) 308-4027.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

  
**JEFFREY STUCKER**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**